KODAK SAFETY FILM +

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 108 TE 001 520

By-Sheridan, Harriet W., Ed.
Focus on Teaching the Humanities.
Minnesota Council of Teachers of English, Duluth.
Pub Date Apr 68
Note-15p.
Journal Cit-Minnesota English Journal; v4 n2 p23-50 Apr 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Course Organization, Cultural Activities, *Curriculum Development, Educational Objectives, English Instruction, English Literature, Financial Problems, Fine Arts, *Humanities Instruction, Instructional Materials, Integrated Activities, Interdisciplinary Approach, *Secondary Education, Summer Programs, *Teaching Methods

Six articles on the problems in planning and executing a high school humanities program are collected here. Wallace Kennedy gives a partial listing of Minnesota teachers and schools that offer humanities in grades 11 and 12. Fred E. H. Schroeder takes up the problems of defining "humanities," selecting good teachers, preparing an interdisciplinary approach, funding the program, and organizing courses. Betty S. Stainer sketches the philosophy and development of units and materials used in a program in 12-grade humanities at Lincoln High School, Bloomington, Minnesota. Martin C. Wiltgen surveys three ways of structuring humanities courses (historical, philosophical, and aesthetic approaches) and evaluates methods of teaching them. David Wee describes the plans, activities, and results of a summer institute in the humanities for talented secondary school students. William D. Elliott presents a case for teaching more world literature written in English, such as Henry Handel Richardson's Australian trilogy, "The Fortunes of Richard Mahoney." (LH)

EDO 33108

MINNESOTA ENGLISH JOURNAL

Published by the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English

VOLUME IV, NO. 2 APRIL, 1968

EDITOR: HARRIET W. SHERIDAN, Carleton College, Northfield
Editorial Assistants: Mrs. Genevieve Hall, Mrs. Nancy Dunham Grauff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLINGS

PAUL ROBERTS on: ENGLISH TEACHING – SOME PREJUDICES
Introduced by Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota 5

FOCUS ON TEACHING THE HUMANITIES

A Note on Bibliography for High School Humanities Courses 23
by Wallace Kennedy, Special Projects Coordinator of Bloomington Schools

Where Angels Fear to Tread: Humanities Programs in the Secondary Schools 24
by Fred E. H. Schroeder, University of Minnesota – Duluth

High School Humanities – Some Whys, Some Hows, and Some Why Nots 28
by Betty S. Stainer, Lincoln High School, Bloomington

Considerations Before Setting up a Humanities Program 34
by Martin C. Wiltgen, Mankato High School

Studying the Humanities: Heaven on Earth? 41
by David Wee, St. Olaf College, Northfield

The New Commonwealth: World Literature Written in English 47
by William D. Elliott, Bemidji State College

REVIEW OF BOOKS

Herbert J. Muller's "USES OF ENGLISH" (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967) 51
reviewed by Clarence A. Glasrud, Moorhead State College

Rebecca Caudill's "DID YOU CARRY THE FLAG TODAY, CHARLEY?" . . 56
(Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966) *reviewed by Tom Walton, Ely Elem. School*

FORUM

Justifying Literary Study in Aesthetic Terms 58
by David V. Harrington, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter

Guidelines for Student Teaching: An Adaptation of the Stanford University Performance Criteria in Teaching to an Activity in Language Arts 63
by Lucille Duggan, Richfield High School, and Sister St. Alfred, College of St. Catherine, St. Paul

TE 001 620

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A NOTE ON BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR HIGH SCHOOL HUMANITIES COURSES

BY WALLACE KENNEDY
Special Projects Coordinator of Bloomington Schools

Humanities courses being taught in Minnesota are as various as the teachers who design and teach them. They follow organizational schemes that are interdisciplinary, chronological or thematic and they may be philosophically, historically or structurally focused. Their bibliographies are better understood within the context of each course syllabus. They are probably best understood from visitation to see them taught.

A partial listing of teachers and schools that offer humanities is given with the suggestion that appeals be made to those schools for information about course content.

Humanities at Grade Eleven

John Goodnature
Albert Lea H. S.
Albert Lea, Minnesota

James Warren
Alexander Ramsey H. S.
Roseville, Minnesota

Gene Lohman
F B Kellogg H. S.
Roseville, Minnesota

Donna Marshall
St. Anthony of Padua H. S.
830 N. E. Second Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Humanities at Grade Twelve

Orville Gilmore
Albert Lea H. S.
Albert Lea, Minnesota

Neal Luebke
Robbinsdale H. S.
Robbinsdale, Minnesota

Donna Marshall
St. Anthony of Padua H. S.
830 N. E. Second Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Cornelia Nachbar
English Coordinator
Indep. School District 271
Bloomington, Minnesota

John Loegering
St. Louis Park H. S.
St. Louis Park, Minnesota

Jerry Villars
Stillwater H. S.
Stillwater, Minnesota

Martin Wiltgen
Mankato H. S.
Mankato, Minnesota

Wallace Kennedy, a John Hay Fellow in Humanities at Columbia University in 1957-68, has taught English and Humanities courses at Albert Lea High School and John F. Kennedy High School in Bloomington.

WHERE ANGELS FEAR TO TREAD:
HUMANITIES PROGRAMS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

BY FRED E. H. SCHROEDER
University of Minnesota – Duluth

In planning a humanities program there is some danger of having fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I shouldn't like to have the imagery regarded too literally, for I don't like to think of myself as clothed in either identity, even though I have had some experience in rushing in where angels had feared to tread. Some years ago I was hired to teach junior high school "core," a curricular term which antedates the more sophisticated-sounding "humanities." What I was expected to do was to teach American history and English. Since I rather prided myself in having an integrative mind, I envisioned a perfectly dovetailed integrated course in which my students would study the history and the literature of given periods and places in American life, whereupon they would exercise their learning in free-wheeling themes. But I failed to do as I had intended, and ultimately divided the two-hour period evenly between history and English.

Now, with the angelic credentials of a degree in American Studies and five years' experience in teaching college humanities courses, I know a little more about why angels may have feared to tread where I had rushed in. Furthermore, I now see a spate of problems involved in planning any kind of humanities program in the secondary school.

The first of these problems is that of defining the word "humanities" so that teachers, students, and maybe even parents will have some common ground of understanding. One valid definition of "humanities" is the study of Humanism, that is, the "Great Books." Another valid definition of "humanities" is the study of the humanities, that is, the arts and social studies. The inclusion of social studies is debatable, but when it is considered that many works which are by any definition humanistic (Plato's Republic; More's Utopia; Castiglione's The Courtier) are also unquestionably social studies, it seems patent that any humanities course of study must include both the arts and the social studies. The distinction between these definitions of "humanities," however, is easily resolved if we regard "humanities" as an integrative ~~study of man's~~ problems, and of man's achievements. The key term is "integrative." There are two

traditional academic methods of integrating the study of man; first, offering courses which integrate materials from the various disciplines; second, offering courses of study which expose the student to the various disciplines per se; thereupon requiring some kind of integrative project or seminar.

The problem which develops out of the first method is the possibility of superficial eclecticism. The problem which develops out of the second method is administrative. Eclecticism is often a misunderstood term. It ideally implies educated selection from varied sources for the purpose of developing an integrated whole that incorporates all of the best. In practice, eclecticism in humanities courses frequently results in one's roaring up and down the centuries, skimming off choice morsels passim. That is, it produces thirty-week courses in Man, God and the Universe--with pictures. On the other hand, the piecemeal exposure to the several disciplines in separate courses is disintegrative, and the possibility of preparing an effective integrating seminar is slim, what with the usual poor viscosity in the flow of communication among the departments of English, history, social problems, art and music, and what with the additional problem of finding a teacher suited for such a task.

For either method of integrating a humanities course of study, the selection of the teacher is the major and essential task. The teacher must have an integrative mind, which may be the result of his academic training or of his own natural talents, or all too rarely, both. His interests must be broad, not only as they are implied in his college transcript, but also as they are exhibited in his way of life. Many humanities majors are such only because they were too snobbish for sociology and too ill-disciplined for the more conventional major programs. A humanities degree is sometimes a cocktail-party patina which scratches all too easily in the academic grind. Furthermore, breadth of interest and training is not always coupled with organizational ability, and any interdisciplinary program is a slippery creature to hold onto, exasperatingly octopusian in its direction.

Octopus or not, a true humanities course must be interdisciplinary. If one limits the study of man and his problems and achievements to philosophical matters, this is a philosophy course, not a humanities course. If one limits the study to literary achievements, it is a literature course, not a humanities course; and if one limits the study to social achievements, it is

a history course. Moreover, merely lacing philosophy, literature or history courses with a few slides and a warmed-over award-winning television documentary is not integration. Nevertheless, such practices are a step in the right direction and might very well be planned as an intermediate stage in moving toward humanities in the secondary school. It has been said that if English teachers and history teachers did their jobs, humanities and interdisciplinary studies would never have been needed. Let me explain.

Ordinarily in history and literature courses we cluster ideas around some convention of the prevailing ethos, such as Romanticism or the Enlightenment. Such an ethos will evoke intellectual creations in various forms. Consequently, there are often close relationships among artists in the different creative fields. Thus, in American romanticism, the cult extended from the writers Bryant and Emerson to the painters Thomas Cole, Asher Durand, and Washington Allston. Although there can never be a one-for-one relationship between the arts, common themes and attitudes are always there, and exposure to one medium will reinforce the image in the other media. In a remarkable number of instances, too, artists worked in several media. William Blake, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, D. H. Lawrence and E. E. Cummings, for example, were painters. Hector Berlioz, Richard Wagner, and Gian-Carlo Menotti were at times their own librettists. Francis Hopkinson and John Dowland were composers, and Thomas Jefferson was an architect. Even where the relationships are not necessarily so immediate, the juxtaposition of artistic products from different fields is valuable. For example, one can relate Alexander Pope to Thomas Rowlandson, Ludwig van Beethoven to Kaspar Friedrich, Carl Sandburg to Aaron Copland, or Walt Whitman to Matthew Brady. Frequently, too, artists select their themes from other artists. John Quidor painted scenes from Washington Irving. Gustave Dore illustrated the Divine Comedy. Deems Taylor composed music for Through the Looking Glass, Henry Purcell for The Fairy Queen, and Charles Ives illustrated Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne and Alcott in a piano sonata. These and many other parallels and relationships can be profitably brought into the English or history classroom--if one can locate and afford the supplies and equipment needed for their presentation.

This is the final problem of a humanities course of study. It is expensive. Slides, both purchased and specially made, film strips, movies, and recordings for only one course can cost up to $2000 or

even $5000, and the equipment for presenting them as well as a teacher's time expended in ordering and organizing the materials are additional costs. For this reason, a modest budget spent to enrich existing courses over several years' time might be a better starting plan than a full-blown humanities program.

Money isn't everything, though. A thousand slides and a Schwann-filled music library are no aids to education if the teacher is not able to use them. A salted mine is no more than a salted mine, and no student will strike intellectual paydirt from the mere garnishment of a literary course with non-literary sources. He must be taught to see and to hear closely and critically, and he must be taught by a teacher who himself sees and hears. The disciplines are disciplined. The truly interdisciplinary must be proficient in more than one discipline and at least passively competent in all. An admittedly Botticelli-like quiz might help explain my point: two paragraphs above some thirty-five persons and titles were mentioned. If you are not quite familiar first-hand with specific works of, let us say, thirty of these artists, you probably are not yet ready to teach a humanities course. And if you didn't catch the contemporary allusions to Schwann and Botticelli you may not be the aesthetic swinger that you may have thought yourself to be. Also, the thirty-five names mentioned are rather local in time and place--they include no classical allusions, no oriental allusions. The only medieval name is Dante; the only Baroque, possibly Purcell. In short, there is no undisciplined short cut to humanities.

All of the above, I'm afraid, has been rather negative. Let us suppose, however, that one has the teacher with an integrative but disciplined mind, a faculty to support him, and a generous budget. How does one organize the course?

There are three approaches to interdisciplinary humanities courses, any of which are good. These three approaches are area studies, period studies, and problem studies. In area studies, one is usually limited to American or British studies (or some region of these nations) because of the language barriers in other cultures. In period studies, one could specialize, for example, in classics, or the renaissance, or the enlightenment. Here, since one ranges across many national borders, reading works in translation is not so provincial. Finally, in problem studies, the teacher selects one or more themes--religion, liberty, the image of man, for instance--and examines these throughout world history. In the final accounting,

no matter which approach is used, it will be, to a degree, a combination of all three. Thus, American studies is necessarily limited in time period--post 1500 A.D.--and will probably be further limited in theme--for example, the frontier or anti-intellectualism or nationalism.

All the troubles involved, however, are worthwhile. The ideal of humanities courses hardly needs defense. In every sense of the word, they are liberalizing for the student and the teacher who are freed from slavish specialization, from limited exposure to the literary products of culture and from narrow cultural provincialism. Humanities courses can effectively enrich the student's academic experience more than any other kinds of courses, and although they are, because of the sophistication of the materials involved, best suited for the high ability student, the sweeping variety of the education experience is equally appealing to the less able student. Nonetheless, I still say step, don't rush, where the angels have feared to tread. Their fears have not been unfounded.

Fred E. H. Schroeder, former public school teacher, and a contributor to SEWANEE REVIEW, E J, AMERICAN QUARTERLY, ETC., is now at the University of Minnesota – Duluth.

HIGH SCHOOL HUMANITIES – SOME WHYS, SOME HOWS, AND SOME WHY NOTS

BY BETTY S. STAINER
Lincoln High School, Bloomington

The place of the humanities course in the high school curriculum has been a much discussed subject in the past few years. Many English teachers have wrestled with the problem of the feasibility of placing humanities at the high school level. The pro-humanities voices have been increasingly stronger, and now the problem has become more how to structure the humanities program rather than whether to teach humanities.

Although there are many advantages to a humanities approach to English, there are also pitfalls. Those of us who helped develop a 12th grade humanities curriculum in Bloomington have become increasingly conscious of both the advantages and the weaknesses of the humanities program which is now in its fourth year in the Bloomington high schools. Perhaps a brief sketch of the development, philosophy, revision and continuing re-revision of the curriculum will point up

both these problems.

In the spring of 1964, four Bloomington high school senior English teachers were asked by the English Co-ordinator to help prepare a humanities course geared to the top ten per cent of the senior class. All that summer we wrestled with what to teach and how long to spend on each part of the curriculum. We developed a basic philosophy which has not been fundamentally altered: that the honors English curriculum should provide an opportunity for students to consider philosophy, music, architecture, and literature as expressive of the prevailing world "view" of a period. We narrowed the field to the Western World, and since we wished our main emphasis to be on literature, we included genre studies of expository writing, drama, novels, and poetry.

By the end of the summer the humanities curriculum was ready - complete with lecture assignments and a day-to-day lesson plan for the whole year. The class was to be taught by six teachers to about 100 honor students. While most of the time was to be spent in non-directed small group discussions, the groups met together for lectures, films, and field trips.

At the end of the first year, we revised the curriculum. We had found that (1) The materials we had so carefully chosen did not always live up to our expectations; (2) The tight scheduling threw teachers and students into a frenzy when there was a sudden pep fest, senior class meeting, honor society initiation, snow day - ad infinitum. (The irony of the scheduling situation was that since we were nearly always "off" the schedule given to the students at the beginning of the year, the students felt we weren't well organized); (3) Non-directed group discussions are slow, and not always as fruitful as they might be, and verbose teachers have a hard time not talking except when asked a direct question by the students, and an even harder time not turning the answer into a twenty minute lecture; (4) Some of the more complex areas we felt the students could comprehend, such as logic, were a little difficult for even the best high school senior English student.

We spent much time the summer of 1965 revising and preparing to teach the course in two high schools with three teachers (two former team members and one new member) in each building. During that year, we scheduled exchange lectures and joint field trips. This proved difficult, and at times impossible, so at the end of the '65-'66 school year, a congenial divorce

was arranged, and though we have done some joint revision, the two programs have developed separately. At Kennedy the class has not remained completely team-taught because of scheduling problems, so at present two teachers may work together one period, two different teachers work together another period, and one of the teachers may have a single section to make a total of five sections. At Lincoln the class remains team-taught. The course is now offered to approximately the upper twenty per cent of the senior class in both schools. Thus, the present structure of the program has changed, but the basic curriculum has remained the same with minor changes in specific novels, plays, and other material.

At present the units covered include these: expository writing; Greek drama, philosophy, and architecture; Hebrew and Christian philosophy, history, and literature; European Medieval and Renaissance art, architecture, music, philosophy, and literature; modern art, architecture, philosophy, music and literture; and a poetry unit.

Specifically, materials covered in each period are these: Greek period: Greek theater and theology, philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, forms of Greek architecture. Readings include the Theban Plays of Sophocles coupled with readings from Aristotle's Poetics; The Oresteia of Aeschylus; readings from Plato's Republic. Lectures on Greek architecture include many overhead projections of sample architecture and various forms of construction of buildings and of Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian styles. Students write several essay tests, and either sketch or photograph samples of Greek columns found in Minneapolis.

Expository writing: review of stylistic techniques, discussion of semantics, the fundamentals of syllogistic reasoning and its use in argumentation, writing of several compositions including definitions of concrete and abstract words, abstract ideas, and an argument which will be rewritten by each student until he makes an A on the paper.

Bible unit: Lectures on Hebrew and Christian history and theology. Readings include the articles in Life Magazine, December 25, 1964. This issue was devoted entirely to discussion of Biblical lands, background material concerning translations of the Bible, notes on archeology, and most important of all, a sequential condensation of Old and New Testament history, theology, and philosophy and excellent reproductions of religious art. Other readings include the

entire books of Genesis, Exodus, Ruth, Job, Luke and John, and readings from Leviticus, Isaiah, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes. Students write essay tests, character sketches, and parables.

The Medieval and Renaissance period: Lectures on philosophies of the Stoics, the Epicureans, the Cynics, the "Courtiers," and specific philosophies of Descartes, Pascal, Erasmus, More, and Luther. Lectures on music - the Gregorian chant, the troubadors, the madrigals, development of Baroque music. Lectures and viewings of Byzantine art, and European Renaissance art including Giotto, Michelangelo, DaVinci, Raphael, Rembrandt, Van Eyck, Holbein, Durer, to mention a few. Study of architecture, including a local tour of churches which are representative of Byzantine, Gothic, Romanesque, and Baroque styles. Readings include: parts of Beowulf and Canterbury Tales, The Second Shepherd's Play, Everyman, Machiavelli's The Prince, More's Utopia, selections from Castiglione's The Courtier, sonnets from Petrarch to the modern period, and Hamlet. Students write critical essays on some of the works read, character sketches, sonnets, critical essays on art and music. In addition to the one day architectural tour, students spend a day at the Minneapolis Art Institute viewing the collection of Medieval and Renaissance art.

Modern period: readings from and lectures on existential philosophy including Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Buber, Sartre, and Camus. Lectures on, and viewings of samples of modern schools of art including the cubists, the Dadaists, the impressionists, op art, and pop art. Listening to and lectures on modern music including jazz, semi-classical, opera, folk, electronic. Reading includes: Moliere's Pretentious Ladies, Ibsen's Enemy of the People, Shaw's Pygmalion, MacLeish's J.B., Chayefsky's Gideon, Kapek's The Insect Play, Ionesco's The Bald Soprano, Golding's Lord of the Flies, Boulle's Face of a Hero, and Camus's The Plague. Much critical writing is done.

Poetry Unit: As a basic text, we use Introduction to the Poem, by Robert W. Boynton and Maynard Mack (Hayden, 1965). Because we are especially pleased with the approach to poetry presented in this text, we follow the outline of the book and add any sample poems from other sources which we find helpful. During this unit students concentrate on writing poetry.

Although the material covered is divided into units, these are only units of concentration rather than separate compartments of study. As each area of concentration is studied, it is incorporated into what

students have studied previously. Thus, as we read Hamlet and J.B., we still discuss the Greek tragic hero. Likewise as we read the Canterbury Tales, J.B., Gideon, and as we listen to music and look at art and architecture of the Medieval Period, knowledge gained in the Bible unit is incorporated into our discussions.

In addition to the material covered, each student must have completed an independent project before spring vacation. The project consists of a research paper, a creative production, and an oral report. Each student chooses some humanistic subject, but is encouraged to pursue a field of interest he has not previously concentrated on. For example, students write and produce plays, sculpt, do oil paintings, design and make models of an "ideal home," design costumes for a play, or work in some aspect of dancing. Students who compose music, sculpt, or paint are not graded on the basis of a perfect product but are reminded that even if the sculpture cracks, or if the music sounds discordant, they have at least learned what not to do. The emphasis is on learning and on creating rather than on perfection.

During the year students are taken on additional field trips when opportunities arise. This year we attended an evening performance of The House of Atreus at the Guthrie and will attend a performance of Britten's opera Midsummer Night's Dream in the spring.

Perhaps at this point an obvious danger of the humanities curriculum will be clear. We began developing the curriculum with the intent of "in depth" study of selected philosophies and works of literature. With each teacher adding a work he felt was "terribly important," the amount of material covered in the curriculum indicates that we are trying to capsulize three quarters of college freshman humanities, plus some facets of the traditional senior English curriculum into one year. When this happens, we begin to place impossible homework demands on our students and we lose depth coverage. We will revise again this summer.

Another obstacle to the success of the present program is the wider ability level of the students. We moved from four ability groupings in English to three. The placing of twenty per cent of the seniors in the humanities program was, I feel, a mistake. We cannot move as rapidly nor go into depth as much as we were able to do with more select grouping; thus the quality of the program has suffered.

One of the most critical weaknesses of the humanities program this year is the larger "small group" sizes. This increase in group size was forced on us by greater enrollment and larger teacher-pupil ratios in the English department. Most English teachers at Lincoln this year carry loads of 140-160 students. With 20 to 23 students in each "small" humanities group, productive discussion is more difficult. We have found that when there are more than 18 students in a group, there is a significant loss in participation. We feel 15 students is an optimum number for our humanities discussion groups.

Though we have not avoided pitfalls, and though we see the problems involved in such a program (one significant problem is the tremendously increased teacher preparation), we feel the advantages of such a program are many. In such a course, the student gains a better perspective of the place of literature, and does not view it as being isolated from the "real world." Students in such a course are forced to think, and to come to conclusions for themselves. They are not spoon fed. Although the discussion is not totally non-directed, the teacher remains a resource person, and uses inductive methods when direction is necessary.

Along with the advantages such a program offers students, teachers also benefit from teaching such a class. An English teacher who does any kind of adequate job in working with a humanities curriculum must broaden his knowledge, must become more flexible, must learn to work with other teachers, and must teach and learn with students rather than impart information to them. A teacher with more knowledge and more flexibility is a better teacher five periods a day; thus many students in regular English classes benefit indirectly from the humanities program.

English teachers in Bloomington hope that the pilot program at Kennedy in 11th-grade humanities can be expanded; and so far as we are concerned, there is every reason to believe that there is a place as well in the 10th-grade honors English curriculum for a humanities program.

Betty S. Stainer teaches English and Humanities at Lincoln High School in Bloomington.

CONSIDERATIONS BEFORE SETTING UP A HUMANITIES PROGRAM

BY MARTIN C. WILTGEN
Mankato High School

Many secondary schools throughout the United States have introduced into their curricula humanities courses as an added elective course in the non-science program of studies. In many instances this has been the only new addition to the non-science curriculum for too many years. Charles R. Keller, former director of the John Hay Fellows Program, states

> These courses constitute a needed challenge to the present separate-subject-dominated curriculum. Knowledge is now compartmentalized in the familiar five-classes-a-day, five-days-a-week pattern. Subjects have little relation to one another. Fusion of knowledge, when it does occur, results more from accident than from design. The student's day, week, and year are mad scrambles as he moves from subject to subject, usually learning without being involved, frequently simply overcome by continuous exposure to unrelated subjects. Compartmentalized education may have fitted a more unified era when fewer people had much formal education. It must be questioned in a more complex, atomistic, disjointed period when so many human beings are rootless, mobile, unconcerned about others, and without standards of value. (Charles R. Keller, "The Humanities in Our Schools." A talk given at an Institute for Teachers in the Hamden, Connecticut, schools: January 4, 1966.)

Generally, these humanities courses fall into three types of course structures or combinations of these three. They are most usually centered around the historical, philosophical, or aesthetical approach.

I.

The historically structured humanities course is most generally a class in world civilizations with the emphasis on what has happened to what is happening. Although it is not a history class in the sense of studying political and economic events, it has overtones of a history of cultures course where the socio-ethnic, cultural, and religious aspects of civilizations are

covered.

The organization of the course is chronological and more often than not the program begins with the pre-Greeks and ends with the modern world with its emphasis on Western Man. The major concept desired from such a historically structured humanities program is the knowledge of tradition.

This type of course structure has the advantage of easy organization since it is usually chronological in its approach to each civilization. It is most frequently taught by the lecture and discussion method with accompanied readings. Of course, many other resources such as tapes, transparencies, films, recordings, and slides can be and are utilized to add to the understanding of each culture studied.

The disadvantages of such a course are that it attempts to cover too much in too short a time and that it does very little for the student's capacity to experience his feelings on the subject matter since it is concerned with the accumulation of factual information. It tends to develop the "parrot-complex" in students, the ability to repeat the information programmed into the student.

II.

The philosophically structured humanities course is usually a class in the history of philosophy and the study of philosophical problems with the concern for the student's capacity for reasoning. It is usually a course that is centered around types of philosophy--ethics, logic, epistemology, aesthetics, and metaphysics-- and problems presented in each type, or the study of the "Great Ideas" from the Great Books. The majority of the humanities courses stressing this approach tend to emphasize Western philosophical issues.

This type of class is often a disguised information course and it aims at problems which are basically set up for the class. More frequently than not, a high school course such as this is topically organized; that is, it is centered on specific problems that have always been unanswered. At the high school level a detailed survey of the problems of the types of philosophy is rather difficult for the students; therefore, the problems are centered or topically organized for the students.

The philosophically structured program has the advantage of fairly easy organization as well as the historically structured program. It is fascinating and

challenging for the teacher since it tends to encourage participated involvement on the part of the students. For the high school student and the college freshman it is a very appealing approach because they are at the "self-identity" period in intellectual and emotional growth, and they like to identify themselves with some trend of thought and/or philosophical school.

This type of class is usually taught by the lecture-reading-discussion method which encourages some extremely thought-provoking discussions between the students themselves and the teacher or teachers. However challenging this program can be, it does have the more than probable disadvantage of becoming a vague and watered down course where not much is ever really decided if too much is covered.

III.

The aesthetically structured humanities program is more often than not a highly analytical observation of works of music, art, architecture, literature, and philosophy. The degrees of analysis are usually threefold: the appreciative level, the interpretive level, and the critical level. Through these degrees of analysis the students acquire the understanding of the specific dimensions of each area necessary for appreciation, interpretation, and criticism. Such a course is basically "experiential"; that is, the students are confronted with the work of art itself through reading, seeing slides and movies of the visual arts, and hearing recordings and/or going to concerts.

The results desired from such a course structure as this are the ability to appreciate, interpret, and criticize works of art; and to develop sensitive and informed analysis of the works studied.

The methods of instruction used in this type of course structure are the demonstration, the lecture, "readings" of works of art, music, and literature, and the lecture-demonstration-discussion.

This type of course structure is difficult to organize because of the problems in selecting works and texts which will best develop the capacity for critical analysis. It has the severe disadvantage of difficulty in finding staff personnel to teach it. Such a class tends to become too analytical where the art form being studied is so dissected as to totally dismember the meaningful unity of the whole art work, and by so doing the purpose of the arts as education and experience is lost. However, if well taught by one teacher or a team, such a course encourages involvement

on the part of the students whereby much is gained.

In addition to the historically, philosophically, and aesthetically structured programs in the humanities there are combinations of all three structures or combinations of two.

IV.

There are, of course, some problems and dangers that ought to be considered in setting up humanities courses. Professor Fred Stocking reviewed present school offerings and advanced what he called four strong opinions concerning the planning of such courses. Each is worth considering carefully:

1. There is no such thing as an ideal course in the humanities for high school students: an excellent course might be designed in any dozen different ways, and the best course for any school exploits the particular talents which are available.

2. The better courses are usually taught by two or more teachers - one from music or art, one from literature, one from history, for instance. But unless there happen to be two or more teachers who share an exuberant desire to work together in such a course, a single energetic and enthusiastic teacher, with diverse interests and a mastery of several disciplines, might well be preferable.

3. The best courses awaken that kind of interest in the humanities which is based on depth of understanding rather than on a glib familiarity with names and titles, or on the social fun of field trips. That is, good courses never make any attempt at coverage. One novel, one painting, and one opera out of the middle of the 19th century might well provide more than enough material for a semester.

4. The goal of such a course should be: first, to arouse interest in the arts as providing experiences valuable for their own sake; second, to show that an art work acquires deeper meaning when placed in its historical context; and third, to make clear that a full understanding of-- and delight in-- any one of the arts requires the eventual mastery of difficult, complicated, and highly rewarding intellectual disciplines. (Fred H. Stocking. "High School Humanities Courses: Some Reservations and Warnings." The English

Leaflet 53 (5): 37-38; Fall, 1965.)

Whenever a school decides to implement a program of studies in the humanities, the planning staff member or members should keep in mind that they should carefully evaluate the personality of the community and the school and decide precisely what they feel would best suit their particular circumstance. They should ask, "What is it that we feel our students should have?" As a result of having asked this question many schools have different programs in humanities. Another factor which needs serious consideration is the matter of very clear curriculum articulation; that is, of not duplicating a subject area that is already covering certain academic disciplines. As a result of this careful curriculum analysis, some programs in the humanities serve a very important function in the school as being the only interdepartmental course where several disciplines are merged into a meaningful whole for the students.

Schools which have programs in the humanities gear them to the types of students they want in the class. Many of the programs in the humanities are geared for the pre-college and/or accelerated student. The criterion for being in such a humanities class is most generally the grade point average of all subjects or the composite average of English and history. Although programs with the academically elite in them are rich in content, student involvement, and interest, I cannot totally agree with the philosophy of offering the humanities to a selected few. The humanities are the huMANities-- for everyone who desires to undertake such study. The main criterion for humanities students should be the desire to take the course.

Those who may shake their heads at this idea need not worry about any resultant watered down program. Although I am not in agreement with homogeneous groupings when it comes to the humanities, such grouping can be done: schedule the more gifted in one group and the "less gifted" (but just as interested) in another group. At the high school level homogeneous groupings sometimes turn into groupings ranging from the "intellectual" group to the "dumb-dumb" group or any other inappropriate labels attached to such groups by students and sometimes by teachers and administrators. To maintain a democratic and/or pluralistic feeling in the humanities heterogeneous grouping is recommended.

Granted the difficulty in staffing for the humanities programs, it need not be an insurmountable problem. What is needed is a teacher or group of teachers

with a well rounded and macroscopic view of the discipline and a high degree of interest. For administrators it is a dream come true to find one teacher who is capable of teaching the program, thereby highly diminishing the problem of scheduling. However, there are certain disadvantages to having a one-teacher program. The most apparent disadvantage is that the students get only one point of view and one bias on the material taught where many points of view should be given. The material selected for the one-teacher program tends to be what that teacher thinks is best, omitting other valuable areas of instruction. Another disadvantage (and this is not only true of the one-teacher humanities program) is the falling off of motivation for the students by having one teacher teach the program; what is needed are many or several different "faces" in order to keep the fire going.

In reality it is a herculean task to expect one teacher to be learned enough in all the diverse areas of the humanities. This is especially true today where there are very few teachers who are graduated with a major or minor in the humanities, and if they hold such a degree it is most generally a degree in the classics.

The most lively and interesting humanities programs are those taught by the team teaching method. The team has the distinct advantage of pooling together several valuable sources of talent. What is of absolute necessity for the team approach is its agreement as to what the discipline of the humanities is. One of the greatest setbacks in instituting the team teaching approach to the humanities is the Carnegie system--six or seven hours of instruction for each day of school. Schools with modular scheduling have circumvented the difficulty of team teaching.

Of the three types of programs in the humanities--the historical, philosophical, or aesthetical approach--two can be taught without too much difficulty by one teacher: the historical and philosophical programs. How well they can be taught by one teacher depends on that teacher's preparation in the discipline. The aesthetical program in the humanities is best taught by the team where each member of the team teaches his area of art, literature, music, or philosophy.

The costs of the various types of humanities programs vary greatly depending on just how many materials and teachers are used. Generally, since textbooks are the main sources used by students, the historically and philosophically structured programs are less

expensive in setting up than the aesthetically structured programs. It should be kept in mind that good single texts are difficult to find and for that reason paperbacks are most frequently used in humanities classes. The aesthetically structured programs are more expensive since they use many sources: tapes, records, slides, books, films, transparencies, and the equipment needed for them.

Cost should not be a factor in education, but since it is, the costs can be spared by the teacher or team if they would make their own materials with the cooperation of the audio-visual department. Often, in fact, a purchased set of materials doesn't meet the specific needs for a particular school's program in the humanities. Schools can make their own colored slides by taking pictures from art books with a 35mm camera, making tapes of recordings that the public and/or school library and other teachers may have, making full use of the bulletin board, and the overhead projector. One of the best sources for materials to be photographed for slides, tapes made from records, and published materials for transparencies is from the class itself.

Recommended for further reading on the humanities are the following articles:

J.C. Baxley, "Humanities for the Less Able Student," E J, 51:485-87, October, 1962.

W.A. Clark, "Humanities Program in the High School," E J, 51:474-76+, October, 1962.

E.M. Copeland, "There Was a Child Went Forth," E J, 54:182-84, March, 1965.

L.K. Frank, "Why Modernize the Humanities?" Educational Leadership, 20(4):220-24, January, 1963.

C.R. Keller "Humanities in an Educational Revolution," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 44:166-73; October, 1960.

C.R. Keller, "The Wave of the Present," E J, 54:171-74, March, 1964.

Martin C. Wiltgen, Humanities teacher at Mankato High School, studied at the University of Chicago as a John Hay Fellow in 1965-66.

STUDYING THE HUMANITIES: HEAVEN ON EARTH?

BY DAVID WEE
St. Olaf College, Northfield

"This was a piece of heaven in an otherwise bleak summer." Few of us teachers in the humanities would publicly assert, I suppose, that our teaching provides anyone with a corner of paradise, although most of us may be secretly sure that the celestial omnibus embarks from our fields more regularly than from the scientific laboratories. But we do believe in the ultimate importance of humanistic studies, and wish to impress this upon a generation of young people weaned on the educational and cultural emphases spawned by Sputnik and the race to the moon. So last summer at St. Olaf College we taught the humanities for five weeks to sixty high school juniors and seniors. Not all of them reacted like the student quoted above, but almost unanimously they expressed gratitude for exposure to an exciting new learning experience. For some it was even a pivotal personal experience, as it was for the student who responded, I think without hyperbole, "I wish to thank all four professors from the depths of my soul."

For over a decade, St. Olaf has conducted highly successful summer science institutes for talented secondary school students, and the college has long wanted to provide a similar opportunity in the humanities. Last year the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation granted funds to establish a pioneering humanities institute at St. Olaf. While more and more high schools are now beginning to offer general humanities courses, many schools lack the resources to offer interdisciplinary courses, especially to large numbers of students. We wanted to introduce students to the breadth and inter-relationships of the humanities, not only because this has intrinsic merit for any human being, but for the practical reason of supplementing the students' subsequent high school and college freshman courses in various humanistic fields. We hoped to send the students back to their senior year in high school or their freshman year in college with a zest for the humanities that might intensify their academic careers and rub off on some of their classmates as well. The enthusiastic student reaction during and immediately following the institute has given us high hopes for such far-reaching results. Furthermore, the institute taught us

much about teaching the humanities interdepartmentally. We will offer it again this summer under another Hill Foundation grant, and we expect to improve upon a successful venture.

The initial cause of the institute's success lay in long months of hard advance planning. The four of us who taught the program -- St. Olaf professors of philosophy, music, art, and English literature -- met almost weekly for a full year to plan the institute before its existence was assured by the foundation grant, and then for another frantic five months before it began. The resulting esprit de corps contributed immensely to our teaching effectiveness. We had discussed our plans so often that we almost felt prepared to give each other's lectures. Virtually every physical and academic detail of the institute fell upon our shoulders, making it impossible to be less than fully committed to each other and the program. This factor can hardly be underestimated, as those who have taught without it will testify.

Our most trying administrative task was screening the applications. One hundred and twenty students applied for the sixty positions. Their almost uniformly high ability was insured through preliminary screening by their teachers, for in order to assure widespread representation we asked that no high school send us more than two applicants. The application required transcripts, rank in class, scores on national examinations, an essay by the applicant, and written recommendation by a teacher. The sixty applicants we admitted included eleven who ranked first in their class, thirty who ranked in the top ten, and all but two who ranked in the top quintile. These two came from cultural deprivation, but bearing impressive letters of recommendation about their intellectual potential. One of our goals had been to accept creative students whose intellectual potential might have been obscured by mediocre grades; we wanted to try to release latent student abilities through an exciting intellectual climate. But few schools sent us this kind of application, and our resulting class was a group of students who had already proved themselves with honors. We hope that in subsequent years the letters of recommendation will lead us to more students whom we might lead out of academic indifference into excitement and real scholarship. Our concern lies less in having an "honors section" than in creating excitement about the humanities in both individuals and classrooms.

Early in the planning we chose our topic: "Romanticism: The Expression of Man's Limitless Self."

We felt that this period of history, and this permanent element of every man, would prove especially fruitful for an understanding of cultural change and the human expression of revolt, both of which concern today's young people. Virtually any carefully-chosen subject could serve the purposes of a humanities institute, but this subject seemed particularly timely for introducing students to some kindred spirits, and thus creating a cultural perspective so many of them lack. The students expressed almost unanimous approval of the topic, and we will use it again for this summer's institute.

We treated the Romantic period topically rather than chronologically except for the first week, when we each presented an historical overview of Romanticism in our field, taking care to relate the period to antecedent impulses of the Enlightenment. We felt that Romantic conventions needed to be displayed against the contrasting background from which they emerged and often revolted. In literature, for instance, the first lecture outlined neoclassical literary conventions and critical standards; this helped the students recognize the magnitude of Romantic innovations. The subsequent four weeks focused upon four general emphases of Romanticism: its response to the past, its attitude toward nature, its celebration of the inner self, and its search for the infinite. This structure proved to be most satisfactory, as it permitted us to interrelate our lectures better than any other organizing principle we considered.

The normal class morning included a discussion period from 8:45-9:45, a snack break, and a lecture from 10:30 to 11:45. The students were divided into eight discussion groups of seven or eight, led by the four professors and the four St. Olaf seniors who worked as full-time tutorial assistants and dormitory counselors. The groups discussed the day's assigned reading before the related lecture, thus encouraging their independent reactions. Throughout the institute these groups remained intact, but each week they had a different leader -- two professors and two assistants. Students found these discussions to be one of the best features of the institute, and everyone contributed with considerable enthusiasm. They seemed to prefer discussions led by the student assistants, for in our absence they felt freer to challenge our lectures. This year we may leave all of the formal discussions to college student leadership.

Monday through Thursday we took turns lecturing, one of us each day, to show how the week's topic

emerged from Romantic literature, art, music, or philosophy. Each week we rotated the order of our lectures, and we attended all the lectures with the class. The art lectures were presented with constant use of two simultaneous slide projectors; the music lectures made frequent use of recordings; and all four of us often gave the students dittoed material to accompany the lectures. In our desire to cover extensive material in a single lecture, we too frequently embraced the pedagogical temptation not to quit, and too many lectures ran until noon. This was disastrous for students unaccustomed to long lectures and panting for an overdue lunch. This year we will probably give two forty-minute lectures each day, with a good break or the discussion period in between.

The most unsuccessful enterprise of the institute was the Friday 10:30 panel discussion, when the four of us answered questions passed up to us on paper from the class. Only occasionally did the students engage us in active dialogue, and their interest flagged as it did in no other institute activity. On the other hand, one of the surprisingly effective matters was the humorous "war" between two of us professors. During the first week one of us prefaced a lecture with an insulting joke at the expense of another professor, who retaliated in kind the next day. The students expressed such gratitude for our unexpected (by them) ability to take ourselves lightly that we continued the barbs for a month, while the students eagerly anticipated the jokes and the other two teachers feigned innocent abhorrence for such unthinkable animosities. After the institute ended, many students cited this repartee as a real joy for them. We are convinced by their response that we should plan some such regular humor in any subsequent institute.

Four afternoons a week the group met from 1:30 to 3:00 in what we called for want of a better term a humanities workshop. We wanted to involve each student in some regular creative or critical activity in one of our fields. There were two series of workshops, each running for roughly two weeks. Everyone took one workshop in a "verbal" area (literature or philosophy) and one in a "non-verbal" (music or art), changing workshops after the first series. Between ten and fifteen students comprised each group workshop, and several pursued independent study for their project.

The art workshop was a studio experience in painting, silk screen, or sculpture. Most of the participants had little technical experience in these media, so the instructor provided daily problems in design

fundamentals. Several students took such interest in their creations that they returned to the studios for countless late hours of work, and proudly took home from the institute the result of their first extensive artistic efforts.

The music workshop consisted of individual or small-group research in Romantic period music, such as the Romantic oratorio, the symphonies of Beethoven, Wagner's "Tristan and Isolde," Chopin's concert etudes, and the French art song. The research was both literary and auditory, involving the extensive recordings, reference library, and listening equipment of St. Olaf's Christiansen Hall. Each student turned in a final written summary of his study-listening procedure and his conclusions. Many institute students had remarkable musical talent, and were fully capable of handling this experience.

The literature workshop involved three types of activity: interpreting fiction, independent research, and creative writing. Twice the workshop met as a group to discuss the themes and techniques of a pre-assigned short story; this was, for many of the students, their first experience with close, critical reading of fiction. Then every student pursued a project either in independent research on a literary topic related to Romanticism, or in creative writing of poetry or fiction. Those doing independent research met two or three times with the instructor in tutorial sessions, and then produced a paper or an oral report. The creative writers met every day as a group under the direction of student assistants, read and criticized each other's work, and turned in the best of their efforts.

The philosophy workshop provided an elementary introduction to logic, as few students were prepared for more advanced work in this discipline. The students met together every day, studying first the nature of logic, then the nature and definition of terms, the formulation of and logical exercises with propositions, syllogisms, and material fallacies. All the work was done through exercises during the workshop session.

The second workshop series included a drama workshop, organized by the students with the help of two St. Olaf drama majors attending regular summer school. After brief but intensive work, this group gave a delightful production of part of Moliere's The Imaginary Invalid at the institute banquet during the last week.

The workshop experiences, then, were various in

nature, in time consumption, and in result. But the students were able to choose two activities that had captured their interest, and they pursued them with gusto. Students evaluated the workshops favorably, and the change of pace from the morning discussions and lectures was refreshing for all of us.

Three other regular institute features deserve mention -- visiting lecturers, field trips, and a film series. These ranged from attendance at lectures by Carleton College and St. Olaf professors on subjects related to the week's theme; performances at the Guthrie Theatre and guided tours of the Walker Art Museum and the Minneapolis Institute of Art; a piano recital by St. Olaf professor DeWayne Wee of Moussorgsky's "Pictures at an Exhibition" which many students later cited as an institute highlight; a picnic at the college farm retreat; and experimental and other films produced by both professionals and college students.

We had considerable difficulty choosing texts for the course, especially in determining the balance of primary and secondary works. We finally decided on these, all available in paperback:

Jacques Barzun, Classic, Romantic and Modern
Marcel Brion, Art of the Romantic Era
J.W. von Goethe, Faust (Abridged version, trans. Louis MacNeice)
John B. Halsted, ed., Romanticism
Howard E. Hugo, ed., The Portable Romantic Reader
David Randolph, This Is Music
J.-J. Rousseau, The First and Second Discourses
Robert D. Spector, Seven Masterpieces of Gothic Horror

Students displayed the usual widely various reactions to these texts, but their comments have led us to reconsider texts for this year. We had them read most of Barzun during the first week, but this proved too heavy and bored them. If we use Barzun again, we will spread out the reading over five weeks, as the students were unable to profit from so much secondary material during their first few days. Readings in Hugo were assigned throughout the course. Hugo's anthology is organized topically, and dovetailed well with our own weekly topics, but students tired of reading bits and snippets. Many requested that we assign readings from fewer authors, and that we include one or two long Romantic novels, such as Wuthering Heights. Faust was popular, but gothic horror they considered camp. Next summer the readings will include a greater ratio of primary sources, with most of the secondary material

on a reserve reading list.

The institute exhausted us. We were with the students every day from 8:45 to 4 or 5 o'clock (seldom did the workshop activity stop abruptly at 3) and two evenings a week; then we raced home to prepare lectures or workshop material, to grade examinations, and to read the material in each other's fields, for we had to lead discussions on readings in every discipline. Even our morning coffee break we used for evaluation and planning. The students worked hard, too. The course was offered for full college credit at St. Olaf if the student so requested (57 of the 60 asked for credit), and we taught it on a college, not a high school level. This made the students scramble, especially as they encountered unfamiliar vocabulary in philosophy and music lectures. We gave two difficult examinations, including a 2½ hour final. But the class performed exceedingly well, earning higher grades than many college classes. Their academic future looks bright.

Most importantly, judging from the six-page evaluation form we gave the students on the last day, the institute apparently accomplished its purposes. It provided an intensive intellectual experience that introduced students to the breadth of humanistic studies, and excited them for more. In the process they learned much about themselves.

David L. Wee is assistant professor in the Department of English at St. Olaf College.

THE NEW COMMONWEALTH: WORLD LITERATURE WRITTEN IN ENGLISH

BY WILLIAM D. ELLIOTT
Bemidji State College

In its November, 1967 Newsletter, M.L.A.'s Group 12 presented the issue of what has formerly been called British Commonwealth Literature:

> 'World Literature Written in English' has been adopted as the title of our newly-established Group to show that our principal concern is the spread of the English language and the English literary tradition beyond their original confines in the British Isles from the late sixteenth to the present. (Joseph Jones, WLWE Newsletter, November, 1967, 15.)

Commonwealth Literature, once the attempt to bring together all the literatures under the British Empire into one body for viewing, has experienced a scholarly growth important to students of literature and teachers alike. With the growth of the countries once a part of the Empire, a significant body of literature has emerged that must be studied as a part of the tradition and history of English literature, since it is for the most part written in English and has been inspired by English cultural borrowings, English education, and written by English expatriots and emigrants. Perhaps the best example is the Australian novelist, Henry Handel Richardson, author of what is considered by some to be the Great Australian Novel - her trilogy, The Fortunes of Richard Mahony. She was born in Melbourne, achieved her early education in the English-modeled Presbyterian Women's College of Melbourne, her later education in the Music Conservatory in Leipzig, and spent the rest of her life in London and London society.

While her influences were Australian in inspiration, her education was British and German; and only by the wildest stretching of the imagination could we consider her literary apprenticeship natively Australian; it had its roots in the novels of Hardy and Eliot, and influences are even traced, in her trilogy, to her awareness of the novel of stream of consciousness as written by Dorothy Richardson and Virginia Woolf. As to her interests in the Australian "tradition," she tells us in her article, "Some Notes on My Books":

> So far, all the novels about Australia that had come my way had been tales of adventure; and successful adventure: monster finds and fortunes made in the gold fields, the hair-raising exploits of bushrangers, and so on. But there was another and very different side to the picture, and one on which, to my knowledge, no writer had yet dwelt. What of the failures, to whose lot neither fortunes nor stirring adventures fell? (Henry Handel Richardson, "Some Notes on My Books," Southerly I, 1963, 14.)

Her concerns lie, finally, with the traditions outside of Australia, in this case traditions that together make the British tradition important as it was infected by the movements in realism on the Continent; and what we find is not another romantic story of Australian settlement, but a deeply pessimistic vision, born of the most inveterate of realists and

the early realists that held the concept of the expansive, leisurely Victorian novel in their minds. A curious combination, but a typical one; and so representative of the various national literatures which make up world literature written in English, and which have their own unity within the boundaries of a country but must be allowed academic recognition and study within and without the country of origin.

It becomes even clearer, indeed, that teaching and studying Henry Handel Richardson and her Australian trilogy must be a process of discovering what is important without the country of origin; and to this list must be included Wole Soyinka in Africa, Hugh MacLennan in Canada, and particularly Doris Lessing and her Children of Violence. We must understand the central disciplines of English Literature so that, as Professor Jones tells us, we can be concerned with "wherever and whenever the first has been used and the second has appeared in the English-speaking world." (Jones, 15.)

For the students of any college and high school in Minnesota, a study of Canadian literature is especially important; but just as vital is an understanding of the place Canadian literature holds in the tradition of literature as it is and has been written in England and the world. To such an end, the study of Morley Callaghan, for example, and Hemingway, is useful; and even the study of Richardson and White of Australia, and Tutuola and Soyinka of Africa, serves as a ready means of comparison in the context of both the Canadian tradition and the larger British tradition. What must be cultivated is an understanding and a teaching of the comparative literatures that make up this vast body of imaginative work. As William H. New tells us in "The Commonwealth in Print," parallels in the Commonwealth literatures exist to such a point that the countries often face similar literary problems.

> The first international conference on Commonwealth literature, held in Leeds in 1964, testifies to this. People came to it knowing their own literatures, but left knowing more; more important, they left knowing each other, having discovered that problems with a language, an identity, an indi-

genpus people, a relationship with Britain, and even with the practical matters of publication were in some way common to them all. (William H. New, "The Commonwealth in Print," Canadian Literature 30, Autumn, 1966, 53.)

William D. Elliott invites students and teachers from Minnesota to his summer session course in Literature of the British Commonwealth, at Bemidji State College.